DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 313 RC 013 582

AUTHOR Nava-Hamaker, Mary Lou
TITLE Academic Achievement of LEP Students After Reclassification: A Southern California Study.
PUB DATE Jun 81
NOTE 69p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Achievement Gains; Bilingual Education; Comparative Analysis; *Elementary School Students; English (Second Language); Grade 5; Intermediate Grades; *Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; *Reading Achievement; Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS California (South); *Monolingual Students; *Reclassification; Spanish Surnamed

ABSTRACT

Gains and grade level achievement in Total Reading and Language of four groups of fifth grade students, including LEP (Limited English Proficient) students, in SES (socioeconomic status) 1 and SES 2 schools were compared to determine whether the students were achieving at grade level in reading and at an equivalent level in language. Groups from SES 1 schools consisted of 44 reclassified Spanish FEP (Fluent English Proficient) students in an English-only program and 108 non-minority monolingual students in the English program. Groups from SES 2 schools consisted of 40 Spanish surnamed FEP students in an English-only program and 50 non-minority monolingual English students. SES 1 and SES 2 schools were formed by matching all elementary schools on three variables (socioeconomic status, Aid to Families of Dependent Children, and percent of limited English proficient/non-English proficient students). Findings indicated that: reclassified Spanish FEP students receiving bilingual instruction for at least 1 year showed gains at the same rate in Total Reading and higher gains in Total Language than non-minority monolinguals, but did not achieve at the same rate in reading and language grade level; and Spanish surnamed FEP students in SES 2 schools lagged significantly behind non-minority monolinguals in both reading and language gains and grade level. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221313

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF LEP STUDENTS

AFTER RECLASSIFICATION:

A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STUDY

BY

MARY LOU NAVA-HAMAKER
DOWNEY, CA

JUNE 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Lou Nava Hamaker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC D1 3582

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of Problem 6

Significance of the Problem 7

Assumptions and Limitations 9

Definitions 10

CHAPTER

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

CHAPTER

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY 26

Description of the Population 28

CHAPTER

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 30

Table 1 Gains in Reading SES 1 35

Table 2 Gains in Language SES 1 36

Table 3 Gains in Reading SES 2 37

Table 4 Gains in Language SES 2 38

Table 5 Reading Grade Level SES 1 39

Table 6 Language Grade Level SES 1 40

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

CHAPTER

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA (CONTINUED)

Table 7 Reading Grade Level SES 2 41

Table 8 Language Grade Level SES 2 42

CHAPTER

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 43

Recommendations for Future Research 46

Curriculum Suggestions for Reclassification 50

BIBLIOGRAPHY 53-54

APPENDIX

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bilingual education has existed in the United States since the nineteenth century. Only since 1968, however, has it become a national reality due to federal funding and corresponding guidelines. Bilingual education programs funded under Title VII include several important components, one of which is the language arts component. Reading in the primary language and oral language development in the second language are an important area of the language arts component and have been given careful scrutiny by studies which seek to determine whether bilingual education programs have been successful or not. The eventual goal of most bilingual programs is to transfer or reclassify the students into English reading and the English-only programs, unfortunately, there is little or no research that examines the achievement of students once they are placed in the English-only program. This type of study would certainly be a valid way of evaluating the effectiveness of a bilingual program although not the only way of doing so. There are many factors that would affect the achievement of students after reclassification such as, number of years in the bilingual program, language proficiency at the time of reclassification,

instrument validity, reading ability in the first language and teacher preparation in bilingual methodology.

One of the problems in reviewing program results has been the lack of uniformity among districts in defining entry and exit criteria. Guidelines were established at the California state level for entry into bilingual programs based on Home Language Surveys.[1] It was not until 1975 and 1976 that both federal and state requirements provided firm direction for developing a reclassification process.[2] Exit criteria are an important consideration in judging the success or failure of bilingual programs since the level of language proficiency should be one of the criteria shaping that decision. Language proficiency affects achievement in reading in both first and second languages.[3] Spanish reading is also a prime and stable predictor of English reading proficiency.[4] Research is still needed to gain more information on what other conditions promote or retard achievement and if one variable can be an indicator

1 Assembly Bill 1329, Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Bicultural Education Act of 1976.

2 Assembly Bill 507, Bilingual Education Improvement and Reform Act of 1980.
Office of Civil Rights, 1975, US. DHEW, 1977, 1980.

3 Mace-Matluck, B. J. Tunmer, W. E. & Dominguez D. SEDL Oral Proficiency Scale. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1979. p 3.

4 Fischer, Kathleen, B., & Beverly Cabello. "Predicting Student Success Following Transition from Bilingual Programs." Paper presented at AERA Meeting, Toronto. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1978.

of success after reclassification, or exit from a bilingual program. There is also very little research available on the extent to which academic achievement is sustained after reclassification to FEP. This knowledge could help improve program quality. Uniformity of exit criteria is also important when dealing with a highly mobile student population to insure proper placement and to avoid reclassification of students before they are ready for success in an English-only classroom. Since students, even within the same school district, can be improperly placed in reading groups and prematurely reclassified FEP, it becomes difficult to assess a program's effectiveness without consistent adherence to such exit guidelines.

One of the most important criteria affecting reading in first and second languages is the level of language proficiency at time of reclassification. The level of language proficiency has been found to affect achievement in reading yet the instruments and assessors of language proficiency can be subjective and inconsistent. In addition, even students fluent in their second language have difficulties which questions whether language proficiency alone is necessary for achievement in the second language. The instruments used to test language proficiency have limitations in their ability to classify students. The policy in California since 1978 has been to use a state-designated test of English proficiency. Due to influences such as the ethnicity

of the assesor and student, socioeconomic status, setting in which testing takes place, and the judgments of untrained observers, different language classifications can be assigned to the same student. Other variables that complicate the decision to reclassify are: The number of years in the bilingual program, teacher observation and preparation for bilingual instruction, number of years in the country, literacy in native language, level of Spanish reading, level of cognitive language proficiency, motivation of the student, perceived prestige of first and second languages, and the self-concept of the learner.

Spanish reading has also been found to be a prime and stable predictor of English reading proficiency, yet few districts take this into consideration when reclassifying a student. The level of reading in the first language is important when considering that if a child experiences difficulties in his first language, the same problems will exist and in some cases, be aggravated by premature transition or reclassification into the second language. Bilingual programs are then blamed for reading disorders and lags when the child would have the reading deficit regardless of the language of instruction. If reclassification is done from a language of strength, rather than one of weakness, perhaps reading scores can be improved and reading difficulties minimized. Most experts in second language reading agree that once a

child learns what reading is all about, he or she does not have to learn to read in the second language, she or he merely learns a new code.

Teacher preparation in bilingual methodology is another important factor affecting achievement of students after reclassification, since a student's needs for continued second language development do not end after one or two years of exposure to the second language. Second language acquisition and second language reading are not usually taught in a teaching methods block, sometimes not even teaching reading in the first language is part of a methods class for teachers. Contrastive analysis, linguistics, teaching English as a second language and culture classes are an important part of teaching a bilingual classroom, however, due to the early lack of bilingual personnel, many teachers now teaching bilingual classrooms are inadequately prepared.

Since most school districts are interested in improving test scores and the achievement of their students, there is a need for an accurate reclassification process which will ensure the achievement of FEP students once they enter the English-only program. This process must be one which gives consistent results. Transfer, transition, or reclassification, the various terms which mark the decision of a district that a student has now reached a full level of English proficiency and is reclassified FEP (Fluent English Proficient) must be followed by

success by that student. To be considered fluent, a student "must have the clearly developed English language skills of comprehension, speaking, reading and writing necessary to receive instruction only in English at a level substantially equivalent to pupils who primary language is English." (EC 52163) However, recent studies (Auditor General, 1980; Development Associates, 1980) have found that some school districts are using indicators beyond a mere "FEP" score on one test to guide reclassification and placement decisions, but many more are basing such decisions on limited or incomplete data.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of the study is to compare the gains in Total reading and Total language, made by fifth grade reclassified Spanish FEP students in an English-only program for a year or more to determine if their gains are equal to those of fifth grade monolingual English students in English-only classrooms from similar SES 1 schools. In addition, this study will look at the gains of fifth grade Spanish surnamed students and compare them to the gains of the fifth grade monolingual English students in SES 2 schools with both groups in an English-only program. The following questions will be examined:

1. How do the gains of reclassified Spanish FEP students compare to those of monolingual English students in the English program?

2. How do the gains of fifth grade reclassified Spanish FEP students in SES 2 schools compare to the gains of fifth grade monolingual English students in the same schools.
3. Are the fifth grade reclassified Spanish FEP in SES 1 schools reading at grade level?
4. Are the Spanish surnamed students in English-only, SES 2 schools reading at grade level?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The civil rights of the limited-English proficient (LEP) and the non-English proficient (NEP) to participate in the United States educational system is protected at both federal (Title VI, Lau vs. Nichols and the Lau Remedies) and state (California's AB 507 and AB 1329) levels. Yet it is increasingly apparent that in order to provide an education that meets the needs of the LEP/NEP child, a uniform exit process utilizing a multi-criteria approach to reclassify students is needed. This would help minimize errors in reclassification and placement which now plague schools districts and contribute to low reading achievement of California's second-language population. A move in that direction has recently come with the guidelines for reclassification suggested by the state and to be mandated by AB 507. A sound, consistent and accurate reclassification is good

educational practice of meeting students' needs.

In addition to the legal and educational requirements to establish reclassification criteria, research studies confirm the existence of a positive relationship between English language proficiency and academic achievement measured in English (De Avila, Cervantes and Duncan, 1978; Duncan and De Avila, 1979). These and many other studies point to the existence of a hypothetical "threshold" or "optimal age" of both language ability and academic achievement which must be met in order for students to be sufficiently prepared to benefit from English-only instruction.

In order to make the best use of limited resources, school personnel and school districts feel pressure to reclassify to FEP status and to exit from the bilingual program those students who they feel are "bilingual" and ready for the English-only program. The guaranteed failure for those students who are reclassified prematurely can become more costly in the end in the loss of human resources that underachieving, dropping out and damaged self-concepts can produce.

The reclassification decision is also significant in that if a child is correctly reclassified, it would be reasonable to expect that reading achievement would at least be equal to that of his non-minority monolingual peers. If the primary prediction of this study holds, then it may contribute to an area of bilingual education that has not yet

been studied extensively, yet is a critical area if research is to have consistent results with which to improve the quality of bilingual programs.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The author has made the following assumptions for this study:

1. All schools in the district are using the state instruments for measuring the language proficiency of students and using this instrument (LAB) to aid in reclassification.
2. All schools in the district are following the district matrix for the bilingual program.
3. All the Anglo surnames students in groups #2 and #4 are monolingual English speakers.
4. All the reclassified Spanish FEP students in group #1 and once in the bilingual program were once Spanish dominant.
5. All the Spanish surnamed students in group #3 are FEP and have had English-only instruction.

This study is delimited to include the following:

1. All fifth grade students in the district with scores in both CAT Total Language and CAT Total Reading for 1979 and 1980.
2. Southern California school district with a high percentage of LEP/NEP population.

3. Only schools with SES 1 contributed to groups #1 and #2.
4. Only schools with SES 2 contributed to groups #3 and #4.
5. Only schools with 20-50% LEP/NEP population contributed to forming groups #1 and #2.
6. Only schools within 5.7-18.7 of the AFDC (Aid to Families of dependent children) were included in forming groups #1 and #2.
7. Only schools with 0 - 4.6% of LEP/NEP contributed to forming groups #3 and #4.

DEFINITIONS

Reclassification: When a student can be considered fluent English proficient (FEP). Reclassification is distinguised from exit. Reclassification does not prescribe that a student be removed from bilingual program.

Reclassification Process: Procedures and criteria used to determine when a limited English speaking LES or LEP or a non-English speaking student (NEP) has learned enough English to be considered fluent English speaking (FES/FEP).

Exit:	When a student is removed from the bilingual program and is placed in an English-only classroom. Exit is only one of several alternatives following reclassification, although, some school districts use the terms reclassification and exit as synonomous.
Fluent English Proficient: (FEP)	Those non-English background students who do have clearly developed English skills of comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to receive instruction only in English at a level substantially equivalent to that of pupils whose primary language is English.
Limited English Proficient: (LEP)	Those students "who do not have the clearly developed English language skills of comprehension, speaking, reading and writing necessary to receive instruction only in English at a level substantially equivalent to pupils whose primary language is English." (EC 52163)

Non-English Proficient (NEP)	Those students who have virtually no English skills
California Achievement Test (CAT):	A standardized test given in English with data on reliability and validity. The Total Reading and Total Language scores from this test were used for this study.
SES 1 and SES 2	The Socioeconomic status scale is from one to three with one being the lowest or made up of laborers and 3 being professionals such as doctors. The state of California in its report on State of California Assessment Program for 1980 was the source used for matching the schools in this study.
Aid to Families of Dependent Children: (AFDC):	Welfare scale on which some federal funds schools are based such as E.I.A. (Economic Impact Aid).
ESL Instruction:	English as a second language instruction involves specific methodology for second language acquisition and includes listening, speaking, reading and writing in the second languge. It takes into consideration the child's culture and contrastive analysis of the first and second languages.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL BASE

A careful review of the literature reveals an absence of research which examines the gains made by students who received transitional Spanish/English bilingual instruction after they have been reclassified Fluent English Proficient (FEP) and entered an English-only program. Since reclassification to FEP status is one of the goals of a bilingual education program, a look at achievement after reclassification would be one way of evaluating the effectiveness of bilingual programs. There are many studies which have dealt with the achievement of students in maintenance bilingual programs. It is helpful to look at these studies once the differences between maintenance and transitional programs have been defined.

A transitional bilingual program seeks to teach the child concepts in his primary language only until such time as he is able to function fully in an English-only program with the primary language completely phased out at that point. A maintenance bilingual program differs primarily in its goal to maintain the student's primary language while he learns the second language. The percentage of language use varies in this type of program based on the needs of the child. In the primary (K-3) grades for instance, the primary language might be used for instruction seventy-five percent of the day and the second language, twenty-five percent of the time. By the time the student is fully able to

function in either language with ease, the usage might become fifty percent in the primary language and fifty percent in the second language. Neither language is phased out completely and the students become biliterate and fluent in two languages whether they are native English speakers or speak other languages.

Although the two programs differ fundamentally and there is a lack of studies on transitional programs, it is important to look at the studies of maintenance programs. These studies answer those critics of bilingual education who claim that bilingual education is harmful or that the effectiveness of bilingual education is unknown.

Several surveys have been conducted to appraise empirical research in bilingual education. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), surveyed over 150 evaluations as part of their work in developing the master plan for the San Francisco schools to respond to the Lau vs. Nichols (1974) Supreme Court Decision.[5] Out of 150 reports, only seven evaluations were found that met minimal criteria for acceptability and contained usable information. Of those that survived this rigorous scrutiny the following relate to the present study:

1. San Francisco, California (Spanish)

   The Spanish Title VII bilingual program students in grade seven showed two months' greater gain than regular district students on the CTBS during 1975-76, and were only 0.1 (one

[5] Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

month) below other district students in the same schools. Additionally, the absenteeism among bilingual program students was less than one-third that of the regular program students (3.6 percent compared to 12.1 percent).

2. San Francisco, California (Chinese)

   Chinese-dominant students in the Title VII bilingual program in 1975-76 were at or above district and national norms in English and math in three out of six grades, and only 0.1 below in two others, as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). In addition, English-speaking students in the program performed at or above national and district norms in all grades, demonstrating that the time spent learning Cantonese did not detract from English language development.

3. Artesia, New Mexico (Spanish)

   On the CTBS, Spanish-dominant children in the bilingual program scored significantly higher than the control group in grades three and four in English and reading, while even English-dominant children in the program scored higher than their control group. In general, the control group children continued to lose positive self-image while the bilingual program children maintained or increased it.

Dulay and Burt (1975), as a corroborational survey of the work of the Center for Applied Linguistics did an independent survey of

179 evaluations and 38 research studies and rejected all but three of the evaluations and nine of the studies because of the following weaknesses in research design:

1. No control for subjects' socio-economic status.
2. No control for initial language proficiency.
3. No baseline comparison data or control group.
4. Inadequate sample size.
5. Excessive attrition rate.
6. Significant differences in teacher qualifications.
7. Insufficient statistics or data reported.

Another team, Zappert and Cruz (1977) surveyed 108 project evaluations and 76 research studies and rejected 95% of these for failing to meet one or more of six criteria for methodological soundess of their research designs. The criteria were the same as those used by Dulay and Burt and are listed above. Zappert and Cruz were left with 66 findings in the nine research studies and three project evaluations which met the criteria for soundness of research design and applicability. These findings were 1% negative, 38 (58%) positive, and 27 (41%) neutral. It is important to emphasize that a non-significant effect, that students in bilingual education classes are learning at the same rate as students in monolingual classes, demonstrates the fact that learning in two languages does not interfere with a student's academic and cognitive performance. In fact, in this case because students

have been learning a second language and culture, a non-significant finding can be said to be a positive by-product of bilingual education. Two of the studies which survived the acid test of the Zappert and Cruz survey and are related to the study at hand are:

1. Alice, Texas- Alice Texas Demonstration Project 1973-74 (Spanish)

   In a four-year program, the experimental Spanish/English students performed significantly better in third and fourth grades with the second grade performing with no significant difference between the two groups. The population was 397 Spanish-dominant students in Alice, Texas and the instrument was the Inter-American Series-English Reading Test. The effect of bilingual education on reading and writing skills in a second language showed significantly better performance by the Spanish-dominant students than the English-only control group when tested in English and when tested in Spanish with the Inter-American Series-Prueba de Lectura. (Spanish).

2. Corpus Christi, Texas Demonstration Project, 1973-1974

   519 Spanish-dominant children in Corpus Christi, Texas in grades 1-3 were tested with the Inter-American Series-Prueba de Lectura (Spanish) and performed significantly better than the control English-only groups in all three grades. The same 519 students were tested with the

Inter-American Series-English Reading Test and outperformed their English-only control group in all but second grade where no significant differences were found.

Altogether, the studies are important because the Spanish-dominant groups were tested in English for English reading achievement. Space did not permit review of many other similar findings and only those studies which dealt with Spanish-dominant students in the Southwest (with the exception of the Chinese study in San Francisco, California) were reviewed. All of the findings reported here meet stringent criteria for valid empirical research and contrary to popular opinion, demonstrate the efficacy of quality bilingual programs in meeting the needs of students of different linguistic backgrounds. As Troike states in his study: Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education:

> "The conclusion is reached that a quality bilingual education program can be effective in meeting the goals of equal educational opportunity for minority language children, and if a program is not doing so, something is wrong with the program."[6]

Dulay and Burt came to a similar conclusion after their survey of research in bilingual education:

> "Contrary to widespread belief, the research conducted to date is not contradictory with regards to the effects of bilingualism

[6] Troike, Rudolph C., Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Vol. 2 No. 5, December, 1978. p.X.

> and bilingual education on student performance...We believe that the research conducted to date strongly supports the use of the child's first-learned, dominant, and/or home language as a medium of instruction in U.S. schools." [7]

In related fields, many investigators have focused on the use of individual difference variables such as self-concept (Cervantes & Bernal, 1976; Cervantes, 1976), cognitive style (Ramirez, Castaneda & Herold, 1974; Ramirez & Price-Williams, 1974), and socialization and child rearing practices (Laosa, 1978) to explain differences which are attributed to cultural, linguistic and personality incompatibilities between language minority students and the mainstream.

A review of these and other studies seems to suggest a failure to operationalize and control for linguistic proficiency which has implications for the conceptualizations and conclusions of these studies. This has resulted in the widespread belief that bilingual children must inevitably face a linguistic handicap with the ultimate effect of lower-intellectual and academic achievement.

Recently, however, there has been an increasing number of studies of the relationship between bilingualism and intellectual

[7] Dulay, Heidi C., and Marina K. Burt. Why Bilingual Education? A Summary of Research Findings. 2d ed. San Francisco: Bloomsbury West, 1978. (First edition, 1975.) p. 3.

functioning which have reported positive results. (Cross-sectional: Duncan & De Avila, 1979, Peal and Lambert, 1962), (Longitudinal: Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Edwards and Casserly, 1973). Another equally positive result was achieved by Cohen in 1974 when he replicated the St. Lambert study with Anglo-American kindergarten children in Culver City, California. The conclusion of several of these studies has been that increased exposure by basically anglophone children to second language benefits not only the acquisition of the second language, but also the development of the mother tongue. It is precisely the speculation of the relationship between degree of language proficiency in two languages (bilingualism) and information processing strategies such as reading which seem to hold the key to academic achievement. In fact, an integration of recent work from such fields as linguistics (Menyuk, 1971), psycholinguistics (Miller, 1951; Kessler, 1971), learning (Harlow, 1949; Blank & Solomon, 1971) developmental psychology (Hunt, 1961; Sinclair & De Zwart, 1969; De Avila, Havassy & Pascual-Leone, 1976) and metacognition (Flavell et al, 1968; Casden, 1972; De Avila & Duncan, 1979; Cummins & Gullutsan, 1974; Cummins, 1978) seem to suggest the possibility that the unique symbolic experiences of the bilingual child may have quite positive results and that these children may be potentially intellectually advanced with respect to concept formation and general mental flexibility.

This paper has reviewed studies which dealt with achievement of students in transitional and maintenance programs and with studies in related fields which tend to support bilingual education but it is necessary to examine issues related to the transference of skills since there is a lack of research in this area.

A paper presented by Bernard Cohen to the National Association for Bilingual Education Conference, April, 1980 deals with those issues related to transference of reading skills from Spanish to English. Cohen suggests that the criteria for exit or reclassification should be based on the question, "In which language will this child best learn?" To answer his question he feels that cognition rather than proficiency in both languages should be measured. Most districts now use instruments which measure language proficiency on the basis of vocabulary and/or syntax. The Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM), The Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL), the James Test of Language Dominance are all instruments of this type. The instrument first used by California, the San Diego Observation and Assessment Instrument (SDOAI) measures only receptive and expressive vocabulary. According to Cohen, these instruments only answer two questions, "In which language does the child have a better receptive vocabulary?" and "In which language does the child have better grammar?" They do not answer the question, "In which language does this child best learn?" Instruments that measure cognitive dominance have recently been developed which

have higher validity coefficients than the previously metioned tests. The Language Assessment Umpire (LAU) and The Language Assessment Scale (LAS) are both instruments of this type. Bilingualism and cognition have so many variables to be considered that it is necessary to use a multi-criteria approach to arrive at a more accurate and valid reclassification point.

Antonio de Porcel and Frank Capell, (1980) have designed a statistical procedure that will validate reclassification criteria. The authors call it "The Prediction Model." [8] De Porcel and Capell use as their core factor the English Reading CTBS/S Total Reading Score and eight other dependent variables including English speaking and listening. This experimental model seems to demonstrate some ability to predict a student's readiness for reclassification. This study is the first that has controlled not only for a student's oral English proficiency, but also takes into account the level that a student is reading in Spanish. It is also important because it is an assessment that uses nine variables to arrive at reclassification. This supports the recommendation for a multi-criteria approach made by the California State-appointed Bilingual Reclassification Committee. (Archuleta & Cervantes, 1980)[9]

[8] De Porcel, Antonio., Capell, Frank. "Statistical Procedures for Validating Reclassification or Transition Criteria." National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Paper presented at The National Association for Bilingual Education, April, 1980.

[9] Archuleta, K., & Cervantes, R. A. Bilingual reclassification criteria report. Sacramento, CA: State Bilingual Reclassification Committee, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education, August, 1979.

An important contribution to the reclassification question is James Cummins' research into the cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency. Cummins argues that a dimension of cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) can be empirically distinguished from interpersonal communicative skills such as accent and oral fluency in both first and second languages. He cites Genesee (1979) to verify the existence of CALP:

> "Genesee (1979) tested anglophone studenst in grades 4, 7 and 11 in French immersion and core French programs in Montreal on a battery of French language tests. He reported that although IQ was strongly related to the development of academic French language skills (reading, grammar, vocabulary, etc.) This was, with one exception, unrelated to ratings of French oral productive skills at any grade level." (The exception was pronounciation at the grade 4 level which was significantly related to IQ).

This distinction between cognitive/academic language proficiency and interpersonal communicative skills is also consistent with the findings of Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa (1976) that, although parents, teachers, and the children themselves considered Finnish immigrant children's Swedish to be quite fluent, tests in Swedish which required cognitive operations to be carried out showed this surface fluency was not reflected in the cognitive/academic aspects of Swedish proficiency. Cummins model may explain why students reclassified as fluent still do not do well in standardized tests or tests which measure cognitive

[10] Cummins, Jim. "The Cross-Lingual Dimensions of Language Proficiency: Implications for Bilingual Education and the Optimal Age Issue." TESOL Quarterly, vol. 14, no. 2 June 1980, p. 175-187.

ability. He suggests that oral cloze tests are more likely to be good measures of CALP than most language measures used by most districts now. In further support of the CALP factor Cummins cites studies by Steve Krashen (1978) who in discussing the Words in Sentence subtest of the Modern Language Aptitude Test notes that this subtest involves "a conscious awareness of language and grammar quite different from the tacit knowledge or "competence" that Chomsky (1965) claims all native speakers have of their language." Wells (1979) also reports that measures of oral language ability derived from spontaneous speech on entry to school were only weakly related to attainment in reading at age 7 in his large-scale longitudinal study of preschool language development. Hernandez-Chavez et al. have also distinguised between natural communication tasks and linguistic manipulation tasks which, they report, "give quite different results in terms of the quality of the language produced."

Cummins states that CALP is more likely to be assessed by linguistic manipulative tasks (oral or written cloze, repetition, etc.) although it can also be measured by natural communication tasks. He suggests that if the purpose of language proficiency assessment is to assign bilingual children to classes taught through the language with which they are most capable of learning, it is essential that these measures assess CALP. He questions any evaluation of the educational performance of bilingual children under linguistically different conditions as

having any relevance. According to Cummins then, cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) can be distinguished from interpersonal communicative skills and is a relisable dimension of individual differences central to academic success in both first and second languages. This explains why older children with a better developed CALP acquire CALP in the second language more rapidly.

The most important variables that have surfaced in this review of literature are: Cognitive language proficiency, initial language proficiency, validity of instruments which supposedly measure language proficiency, number of years in the bilingual program, type of program, transitional or maintenance, and teacher preparation in bilingual methodology. This literature review has also shown a lack of research in achievement of students in transitional language programs after reclassification and the logical question that emerges is, "Can students who are reclassified FEP achieve at the same level as their non-minority, English-only peers?" This study will seek to compare the gains of fifth grade reclassified Spanish FEP students formerly in a bilingual program to the gains of fifth grade, non-minority, English-only students and attempt to answer that question.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The research design chosen for this study was the Ex Post Facto design since the treatment to be studied, bilingual instruction, had already occurred. The data gathered was analyzed using a 2 X 3 X ^{2} since the data is in grade equivalents and lends itself to this type of statistic.

The instrument that yielded the pre and post test scores was the California Achievement Test (CAT). The realibility of this instrument has been tested many times under tightly controlled conditions. Correlation coefficients between the scores of the CAT and those of the California Test of Mental Maturity are unusually high generally falling between .60 and .80 according to Buros.[11]

In order to compare gains it was necessary to collect the CAT test scores in Total Reading and Total Language for the entire fifth grade population; when they were in their third and fourth grades.

[11] Buros, Oscar, The Seventh Mental Measurement Book, Gryphon Press. Highland Park, New Jersey, No. 9.

Using the State of California's report on California's Assessment Program (CAP) the SES, AFDC along with the district count of LEP/NEP from their R-30 report to the state, the twenty-two elementary schools were matched on these three variables. The schools thus matched formed two groups, SES 1 and SES 2.

Groups #1 and #2 were formed from the SES 1 schools. A total of forty-four students were randomly selected from the total reclassified Spanish FEP population in SES 1 schools. The 108 students in Group #2 were randomly selected from the total non-minority, monolingual fifth grade population in SES 1 schools.

Groups #3 and #4 were randomly selected from the SES 2 schools. From the Spanish surnamed population, forty, fifth-grade students in SES 2 schools were randomly selected and became Group #3. Fifty monolingual, non-minority fifth grade students in SES 2 schools were randomly selected for Group #4.

The random selection was by use of a table of random numbers. The selection of the groups was on the following basis:

1. Only students with scores for both years and with scores for both Total Language and Total Reading were given a number.
2. Students with FEP language status (Spanish FEP or English speaking).

3. Groups #1 and #2 must be selected from SES 1 schools and Groups #3 and #4 must be selected from SES 2 schools as matched.

The data was gathered on accountant analysis sheets and then transferred to type. An instrument was designed to gather other pertinent information from resource teachers at each school site. (See appendix).

Permission was requested from the school district to approach the different schools involved for the data needed. When this was granted by the Superintendent's Cabinet, a short letter was drafted to the Bilingual Resource Teachers at each site (or Principal, if no BRT), requesting their help.

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

District X was chosen because of the high percentage of LEP/NEP students and because it has had some form of a bilingual program for a number of years. Intensive ESL is the focus and emphasis of the bilingual program for oral English development. The stated goal is transition into English as rapidly as possible. The matrix describes a four year program. There are 2,323 fifth grade students and of these, 565 were LEP/NEP as of April, 1981. A total of 242 fifth grade students in English-only classes with an equal number of boys and girls served as the subjects for the four groups already described.

VARIABLES THAT WERE CONTROLLED FOR WERE:

size of groups

SES

physical environment

scheduling (2 hour language arts program)

materials: H-200, Ginn 720, Miami Linguistics and Santillana (before reclassification)

sex

oral language proficiency (schools use LAB)

SOME INTERVENING VARIABLES MIGHT HAVE BEEN:

teacher's attitude towards bilingual instruction (before reclassification).

teacher's attitude towards ethnic group and expectations

student's interest in reading and language

attitude and perceived prestige of English by student and teacher

attitude and perceived prestige of Spanish by student and teacher

view of reclassification as expedient for teacher's formation of reading groups.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The first question was tested statistically by use of 2 X 3 X ^{2} comparing Groups #1 and #2 on Total Reading and Total Language gains. The same test was used to compare Groups #3 and #4 and answer questions two, three and four.

SES 1

There was no significant difference found in Groups #1 and #2 in Total Reading. This indicates that the reclassified Spanish FEP students in SES 1 schools are showing the same growth as their non-minority monolingual English speaking peers. The SES 1 schools have full bilingual programs with a heavy emphasis on English oral language development and bicultural activities which may explain this positive result. (See Table 1).

The gains in Total Language for Groups #1 and #2 were significant ($X^2 = 10.10$, df = 2, $p < .01$). The Reclassified Spanish FEP students are showing gains that exceed those of their monolingual English-only

peers. This might be explained by the fact that the monolingual students could have made their greater growth earlier in their elementary schooling while the reclassified Spanish FEP are just now beginning to show growth after their first two years in the English program. The SES 1 schools with high percentages of LEP/NEP may also be placing more emphasis on language. (See Table 2)

SES 2

The gains in Total Reading for groups #3 and #4 were highly significant (X^2 = 35.77, df = 2, p = < .001). Group #3, the Spanish-surnamed FEP students, lag behind their non-minority monolingual English speaking peers although they have had more exposure to English and are FEP. They are in low LEP/NEP population schools (0-4.6%) and are participating in what amounts to an immersion program. (See Table 3)

The gains in Total Language for groups #3 and #4 in SES 2 schools were found to be highly significant (X^2 = 13.35, df = 2, p - < .001) which indicates that in the SES 2 schools the Spanish-surnamed students are not doing as well as the non-minority monolingual English students in the same school. Another interesting findings is that the Spanish surnamed, Group #3 are not doing as well as

their counterparts, the reclassified Spanish FEP in SES 1 schools. This surprising finding tends to lend support to this study's contention that English oral language proficiency alone cannot be the sole criteria on which reclassification is based since the Spanish surnamed students in Group #3 in SES 2 schools have been FEP status since entering school and if some were assessed as LEP they were still put in English-only programs because the school either had no bilingual program or it was a minimal pull-out type.

Generally, in comparing the Reclassified Spanish FEP in SES 1 schools to the Spanish surnamed students in SES 2 schools, they have not shown as much achievement in either Total Reading or Total Language. The explanation for this deficit cannot be blamed on the bilingual program or the SES variable since both have been controlled for.

The highly significant results in the SES 2 schools on both measures lends support to James Cummins Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) theory since the students in SES 2 were assessed as fluent (FEP) and yet their fluency in English has not helped them achieve at the same rate as their non-minority monolingual English peers. (Cummins, 1980)

Because gains comparisons do not give a full picture of the students' achievement and whether they are reading at grade level, further X^2 tests were run for Tables 5 through 7 to answer the last questions of this study.

SES 1

Most of the reclassified Spanish FEP, Group #1, in SES 1 schools are reading below grade level with the next highest group reading at grade level and the smallest group reading above grade level. Most of the non-minority monolingual English students are reading above grade level with the next largest group reading below grade level and the smallest group at grade level. The significance was at the $p = < .01$ confidence level. So although this group (#1) is making equal gains as their non-minority counterparts they are not reading at the same level. (See Table 5).

A significance at the $p = < .05$ confidence level was found between reclassified Spanish FEP in SES 1 schools and their non-minority English-only peers. Most of the reclassified Spanish FEP are above grade level in language with the next highest group at grade level and the smallest group below grade level. (See Table 6).

SES 2

A highly significant finding at the p = < .001 confidence level was found in Reading grade level in SES 2 schools. Most of the Spanish surnamed, English-only students were below grade level with the monolingual English students above grade level. This again, indicates that although these students are FEP status and have had English-only instruction for a longer period than the reclassified Spanish FEP, they are not demonstrating equal achievement. (See Table 7).

In language, significance was found at the p = < .02 level. With both groups having the largest concentration of students above grade level. It is interesting to note that although the Spanish surnamed students were at grade level in language there was no corresponding achievement either in Total Reading or Total Language gains nor in reading grade level. (See Table 8).

On the following pages are the tables that illustrate the summaries given above. The appendix includes the computations used to arrive at the conclusions.

GAINS IN CAT TOTAL READING (English)

SES 1

	LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1.0 TO 1.9 YEARS	2.0 YEARS AND ABOVE	TOTAL
Group #1 Reclassified Spanish FEP	13 (15.63)	25 (19.97)	6 (8.39)	44
Group #2 Monolingual English-only	41 (38.37)	44 (49.03)	23 (20.60)	108
Total	54	69	29	152

(Expected cell frequency) $X^2 = 2.723$, df = 2, $p < .20$

TABLE 1

GAINS IN CAT TOTAL LANGUAGE (English)

SES 1

	LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1.0 TO 1.9 YEARS	2.0 YEARS AND ABOVE	TOTAL
Group #1 Reclassified Spanish FEP	6 (12.74)	16 (13.60)	22 (17.66)	44
Group #2 Anglo Monolingual English-only	38 (27.00)	31 (33.39)	39 (43.34)	108
Total	44	47	61	152

(Expected cell frequency) $X^2 = 10.10$, df = 2, $p < .01$

TABLE 2

GAINS IN CAT TOTAL READING (English)

SES 2

	LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1.0 TO 1.9 YEARS	2.0 YEARS AND ABOVE	TOTAL
Group #3 Spanish FEP English-only	24 (12.44)	15 (16.44)	1 (11.11)	40
Group #4 Anglo Monolingual English-only	4 (12.44)	22 (15.55)	24 (13.89)	50
Total	28	37	25	90

(Expected cell frequency) $X^2 = 35.77$, df = 2, $p < .001$

* Investigations in the distribution of X^2 have shown that when expected frequencies exceed one, the X^2 test is a robust test for contingency tables greater than 2 X 2. (Edwards, 1967)

TABLE 3

GAINS IN CAT TOTAL LANGUAGE (English)

SES 2

	LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1.0 TO 1.9 YEARS	2.0 YEARS AND ABOVE	TOTAL
Group #3 Spanish FEP English-only	12 (6.40)	12 (9.33)	16 (23.55)	40
Group #4 Anglo Monolingual English-only	4 (8.89)	9 (11.67)	37 (29.44)	50
Total	16	21	53	90

(Expected cell frequency) $X^2 = 13.35$, df = 2, $p < .001$

*Investigations in the distribution of X^2 have shown that when expected frequencies exceed one, the X^2 test is a robust test for contingency tables greater than 2 X 2. (Edwards, 1967)

TABLE 4

READING GRADE LEVEL FOR SES 1

	BELOW GRADE LEVEL	AT GRADE LEVEL	ABOVE GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL
Group #1 Reclassified Spanish FEP	18	15	11	44
Group #2 Monolingual English-only	29	25	54	108
Total	47	40	65	152

$X^2 = 8.823$, df = 2, $p < .01$

TABLE 5

LANGUAGE GRADE LEVEL FOR SES 1

	BELOW GRADE LEVEL	AT GRADE LEVEL	ABOVE GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL
Group #1 Reclassified Spanish FEP	5	16	23	44
Group #2 Monolingual English-only	24	21	63	108
Total	29	37	86	152

$X^2 = 5.834$, df = 2, $p < .05$

TABLE 6

READING GRADE LEVEL FOR SES 2

	BELOW GRADE LEVEL	AT GRADE LEVEL	ABOVE GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL
Group #3 Spanish Surnamed English-only	15	11	14	40
Group #4 Monolingual English-only	3	10	37	50
Total	18	21	51	90

$X^2 = 16.50$, df = 2, $p < .001$

TABLE 7

LANGUAGE GRADE LEVEL SES 2

	BELOW GRADE LEVEL	AT GRADE LEVEL	ABOVE GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL
Group #3 Spanish Surnamed English-only	9	9	22	40
Group #4 Monolingual English-only	4	6	40	50
Total	13	15	62	90

$x^2 = 6.63$, df = 2, p (.02

TABLE 8

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to compare the gains and grade level achievement in Total Reading and Total Language of fifth grade reclassified Spanish FEP once in a bilingual program and now in an English-only program for more than a year to see if those gains were equal to those of fifth grade non-minority monolingual students in the English program in SES 1 schools. Another question to be answered was whether the gains of Spanish surnamed FEP students in an English-only program were comparable to those of fifth grade non-minority monolingual English students in SES 2 schools and to see whether they were achieving at grade level in reading and language at an equivalent level. It was hoped that by looking at both gains and grade level, some conception of the reclassified Spanish FEP students' achievement after reclassification could be gained.

After gathering all the data for all fifth grade students in the district, and matching all the elementary schools on SES, AFDC, and

percent of LEP/NEP, two groups of schools were formed, SES 1 and SES 2 (See appendix for matching data) Group #1 (44 students) were randomly selected from all the reclassified Spanish FEP students in SES 1 schools. Group #2 was randomly selected from the non-minority monolingual English speaking students in SES 1 schools. Group #3 was randomly selected from all the Spanish-surnamed FEP students in SES 2 schools and Group #4 was randomly selected from all the non-minority, monolinguals from the same SES 2 schools group.

It was found that reclassified Spanish FEP who received bilingual instruction for at least one year showing gains at the same rate in Total Reading and higher gains in Total Language than their non-minority monolingual peers. They are not achieving at the same rate as their non-minority monolinguals in Group #2 in reading and language grade level. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the reclassified Spanish FEP are just now experiencing a growth in language which was probably experienced by the English speakers eaelier, growth which was retarded while the reclassified Spanish FEP acquired a minimal competency in the second language.

A surprising finding was that the Spanish surnamed FEP students in SES 2 schools lag significantly behind their monolingual non-minority peers. These students are participating in zero to minimal

(pull-out) bilingual instruction and English immersion with low percentages of LEP/NEP populations in SES 2 schools. This group (#3) lagged behind in both reading and language gains and were significantly behind in grade level for both reading and language.

Interestingly, when comparing the achievement of reclassified Spanish FEP in SES 1 schools to Spanish surnamed FEP students in SES 2 schools, the reclassified Spanish FEP in full bilingual programs with a heavy emphasis on oral language development and multicultural activities seemed to improve the achievement in SES 1 schools. So although they were not at grade level in either SES 1 nor in SES 2 schools, they were doing better at achieving equal growth as measured by gains in Total Reading and Total Language and were not as far behind in reading and language grade level as the Spanish surnamed FEP in SES 2 schools.

Although the reclassified Spanish FEP are still not achieving at an equivalent level as their non-minority monolingual counterparts in either reading or language, the bilingual program has had a very significant and positive effect on their achievement when this group is compared to the Spanish surnamed students in SES 2 schools who are participating in little or no bilingual instruction.

The findings strongly support this study's position that a multi-criteria approach to reclassification is necessary if there is to be consistent and positive achievement for LEP/NEP students

after reclassification, since FEP status alone is not an accurate predictor of future academic success in English for the LEP/NEP Spanish student. This study also demonstrates that even transitional bilingual instruction, when coupled with multicultural activities, has a positive effect on a LEP child's academic achievement.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Further research is needed in the area of achievement after reclassification. It is important to do longitudinal studies which compare gains over a period of time after students are placed in the English program to see if growth is experienced at the same rate and is sustained or if it spurts and then reaches a plateau which may not be equivalent to growth of non-minority monolinguals. In a superficial glance at the reading levels of LEP/NEP students in intermediate and high schools, it was apparent that many were still not at grade level after several years in the English program. One of the mandates of AB 507 is a follow-up procedure which requires schools to check the achievement of students after thirty days and six months after reclassification, this is not only necessary but good educational practice.

There are other factors that should be studied in short and longitudinal designs which impact heavily on a bilingual program such as: the academic achievement in primary language before re-

classification and how it compares to achievement in English after transition to the English-only program, decreased grade repetition, increased attendance rates, decreased school violence and vandalism, increased parent participation in school affairs, growth in self-concept, decreased drop-out rate, overall improvement of school climate and teacher preparation.

Instruments which are objective and consistent and that test more than surface fluency must be used to measure language proficiency. There are instruments which measure higher levels of cognition and these measures should supplement those which measure receptive and expressive language. Acquisition of reading and math concepts should not be measured with instruments that require reading in the second language since children do not learn concepts and reading simultaneously (Smith 1978:188, cited in Murphy, 1980)[12] for even when decoding skills are perfected, even when syntax is mastered, no one can understand a text whose concepts have no meaning for them.

12 Murphy, Barbara. "Second Language Reading and Testing in Bilingual Education." TESOL Quarterly. Vol 14, No. 2, June 1980. p. 193

Knowledge gained in one language cannot be measured in another until the student is proficient in the second language and proficiency does not occur in a single academic year, the duration of bilingual instruction for most of the reclassified Spanish FES/FEP in Group # 1. Standardized tests should not be administered until second language students have sufficient control of the language to work with them. One year is not enough, nor even two or three, especially in those areas where English is spoken only in the school. When standardized tests are administered, items, not scores, should be examined in terms of the second language students' access to vocabulary and syntax.[13] CTBS Español, a standardized test, has been developed for bilingual students and describes performance in relation to the national norms for CTBS/S. That is, given a raw score on CTBS Español, the equating study for the technical report provided an estimate of the raw score that a student would have obtained on CTBS/S, this estimate was then referred to CTBS/S norms.

[13] Thonis, Eleanor Wall. 1970. Teaching reading to non-English speakers. New York: Collier MacMillan Internationl. p. 240.

However, CTBS Español, should be used with caution since it assumes a basic competency in both Spanish and English and is for bilingual students and not for LEP/NEP. The publisher, McGraw Hill also warns that testing other than in Spring or using an inappropriate level of test for a student may introduce a systematic bias in the derived scores.[14] Those knowledgeable in the field of bilingual education or second language acquisition, in general, do not support the use of standardized tests in bilingual programs. The fault lies in the general atmosphere of education which stresses scores as measurement of academic success.

Early or premature reclassification of students into English-only programs actually brings about a failure of the primary goal to which most school districts aspire, the eventual ability of the student to function in an all English program. It seems paradoxical, but research has proven that the surest and quickest route to success in English is by mastery of the primary language and a simple transfer of those skills to English. It is a more efficient use of the bilingual teacher's time to teach a concept in the primary language and reinforce it in English than to repeatedly try to teach a concept in English to a child who may eventually be able to parrot "circle" without knowing what it means. Enough reliable research exists on

[14] CTB, McGraw-Hill, Del Monte Research Park, Monterrey, CA.

second language acquisition and on reading to design bilingual programs based on realistic goals that can be measured by appropriate standards. Educators know that few native speakers of English actually achieve reading by the end of the first year so it is preposterous to expect non-native speakers to do so, yet many of the reclassified Spanish FEP had been reclassified into English reading after one year in kindergarten!

The following, well-founded, assumptions have been made:

1. that a certain amount of oral proficiency is necessary before the act of reading can take place (Goodman & Burke, 1972)
2. that reading is a process which involves deriving meaning from a printed text through simultaneous use of graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic information (K. Goodman, 1976)
3. that readers must have experiences to relate to the text or they can only decode nonsense (Smith & Lindberg, 1977)
4. that there exists a dimension of language proficiency beyond basic intercommunicative skills that needs to be developed before there can be success in English (Cummins, 1980)
5. that a multi-criteria approach to reclassification is not only necessary, but good educational practice (DePorcel & Capell, 1980; Cohen, 1980; Archuleta & Cervantes, 1979)

IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM

The following implications for curriculum are engendered from the assumptions above:

1. curriculum provisions for the development of proficiency must include social/linguistic experiences which will enable students to relate the meaning of a particular text to their own knowledge,
2. that charted data to assess development in language, cognitive skills, and concepts can be used for on-going assessment, evaluation and follow-up,
3. that other methods can be used for measuring performance for the LEP/NEP student population such as oral and written close, repetition.
4. that LEA, whole word, whole phrase are valid alternatives to supplement the basal reader for LEP/NEP students,
5. that the process of integrating cognitive skill development with language acquisition can be accomplished through existing materials (i.e. Elementary Science Study (ESS), math manipulatives (Tri-point progression),
6. that the ESL component of bilingual education can and should continue after major instruction in the content areas has ceased or decreased in the vernacular.

Materials and methods already exist which can be utilized to improve program quality. Both have been derived from assumptions

in cognitive psychology and developmental linguistics. These briefly are:

1. Language is used to conceptualize and is developed through conceptualizing with it (Piaget, 1954, Vygotsky, 1962, Halliday 1975, Smith, 1977)
2. Conceptualization is dependent upon sensory-motor experiences and upon encounters with concrete objects and situations (Piaget, 1973, Vygotsky, 1962)
3. Language use is developed, rather than acquired wholesale. The developmental process appears to require hypothesizing incorrect syntactical rules before arriving at correct ones (C. Chomsky, 1969, Burt & Dulay, 1975)
4. Adults guide the process of language development by interacting with children and responding to their meaning (Vygostky, 1962, Bernstein, 1971, Halliday, 1973, Cook, 1973)

Students can and should sustain their achievement after reclassification. If they are not doing so, it becomes the responsibility of everyone involved in those students' education from the classroom teacher to the Superintendent of a district. They must be adamant and uncompromising in their search for ways to improve the quality of their program and their product.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Assembly Bill 1329, Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Bicultural Education Act of 1976.

Assembly Bill 507, Bilingual Education Improvement and Reform Act of 1980.

Office of Civil Rights, 1975, U.S. DHEW, 1977, 1980.

Mace-Matluck, B. J. Tunmer, W. E. & Dominguez, D. SEDL Oral Proficiency Scale. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1979.

Fischer, Kathleen, B., & Beverly Cabello, "Predicting Student Success Following Transition from Bilingual Programs." paper presented at AERA Meeting, Toronto. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1978.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 1974.

Troike, Rudolph C., Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Vol. 2 No. 5, December, 1978.

Dulay, Heidi C., & Marina K. Burt. Why Bilingual Education?: A Summary of Research Findings. 2d ed. San Francisco: Bloomsbury West, 1978. (First edition, 1975)

De Porcel, Antonio., Capell, Frank. "Statistical Procedures for Validating Reclassification or Transition Criteria." National Institute of Education, DHEW. Paper presented at National Association for Bilingual Education, April, 1980.

Archuleta, K., & Cervantes, R. A. Bilingual Reclassification Criteria Report. Sacramento, CA: State Bilingual Reclassification Committee, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education, August, 1979.

Cummins, James. "The Cross-Lingual Dimensions of Language Proficiency: Implications for Bilingual Education and the Optimal Age Issue." State Department of Education, August, 1979.

Cummins, James. "The Cross-Lingual Dimensions of Language Proficiency: Implications for Bilingual Education and the Optimal Age Issue." TESOL Quarterly, vol. 14, no. 2 June, 1980.

Cummins, James. "Linguistic Interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children." Review of Educational Research, Spring, 1979, 49 (2), 222-251.

Buros, Oscar, The Seventh Mental Measurement Book, Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey, No. 9.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods, 2nd ed. 1967, Holt Rinehart and Winston: New York, New York.

Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research, 2nd ed. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. New York, New York, 1978.

Cohen, Bernard. "Issues Related to Transferring Reading Skills from Spanish to English." Bernard Cohen Research and Development, New York, New York, 1979.

Murphy, Barbara. "Second Language Reading and Testing in Bilingual Education." TESOL Quarterly. Vol 14, No. 2, June 1980.

CTB, McGraw-Hill, Del Monte Research Park, Monterey, California.

Thonis, Eleanor Wall. 1970. Teaching reading to non-English speakers. New York: Collier MacMillan International.

Bernstein, Basil, 1971. Class, codes and control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language. Vol. 1. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Burt, Marina K., Heidi Dulay, and Eduardo Hernandez Ch. 1975. Bilingual Syntax Measure. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Chomsky, Carol. 1969. The acquisition of syntax in children from 5 to 10. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

Goodman, Kenneth. 1976. What we know about reading. Findings in research in miscue analysis: Classroom implications. Kenneth Goodman ed. Urbana, Ill: NCTE: 57-70

Goodman, Yetta M. and C. L. Burke. 1972. Reading miscue inventory: Procedures for diagnosis and evaluation. New York: MacMillan Co.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1973, Explorations in the functions of language. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd.

Piaget, Jean. 1954. The construction of reality in the child. New York: Ballantine Books.

Vygotsky, Lev Semenovich, 1962. Thought and Language. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1 COMPUTATION OF X^2

O	E	O-E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
13	15.63	-2.63	6.91	.442
25	19.97	5.03	25.30	1.267
6	8.39	-2.39	5.71	.038
41	38.37	2.63	6.92	.180
44	49.03	-5.03	25.30	.516
23	20.60	2.40	5.76	.280

$X^2 = 2.723, p < .20$

$df = (R-1)(C-1)$
$= (3-1)(2-1)$
$= 2$

TABLE 2 COMPUTATION OF X^2

O	E	O-E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
6	12.74	-6.7	44.89	3.523
16	13.60	2.4	5.76	.424
22	17.66	4.3	18.83	1.066
38	27.00	11.0	121.00	4.481
31	33.39	- 2.4	5.76	.173
39	43.34	- 4.3	18.83	.434

$X^2 = 10.100, p < .01$

$df = (R-1)(C-1)$
$= (3-1)(2-1)$
$= 2$

TABLE 3 COMPUTATION OF X^2

O	E	O-E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
24	12.44	11.6	133.63	10.741
15	16.44	- 1.4	2.07	.125
1	11.11	-10.1	102.21	9.199
4	12.44	- 8.4	70.56	5.672
22	15.55	6.4	41.60	2.675
24	13.89	10.1	102.21	7.358

$X^2 = 35.770, p < .001$

$df = (R-1)(C-1)$
$= (3-1)(2-1)$
$= 2$

SCHOOL MATCHING

School	% of LEP/NEP	SES	AFDC
1	13.3	1.90	12.6
2	19.9	1.66	8.9
3	23.1	1.42	5.7
4	26.8	1.51	11.1
5	34.2	1.42	12.8
6	0.0*	2.53	2.9
7	40.2	1.95	12.0
8	20.9	1.49	18.7
9	3.0	2.29	6.5
10	38.8	1.74	12.5
11	43.8	1.45	9.6
12	24.1	1.41	9.8
13	26.7	1.60	8.0
14	52.7	1.64	8.4
15	37.5	1.40	15.0
16	14.3	2.03	3.6
17	49.7	1.65	11.2
18	4.0	2.31	7.4
19	35.5	1.63	7.0
20	4.6	2.27	5.3
21	7.5	1.97	12.1
22	29.1	1.37	11.8

*Although this school shows 0% of LEP/NEP it does have Spanish Surnamed students in the English-only program.

SES I SCHOOLS

SCHOOL NUMBER	% OF LEP/NEP	SES	AFDC
2	19.9	1.66	8.9
3	23.1	1.42	5.7
4	26.8	1.51	11.1
5	34.2	1.42	12.8
8	20.9	1.49	18.7
10	38.8	1.74	12.5
11	43.8	1.45	9.6
12	24.1	1.41	9.8
13	26.7	1.60	8.0
14	52.7	1.64	8.4
15	37.5	1.40	15.0
17	49.7	1.65	11.2
19	35.5	1.63	7.0
22	29.1	1.37	11.8

SES 2 SCHOOLS

SCHOOL NUMBER	% OF LEP/NEP	SES	AFDC
6	0.0	2.53	2.9
9	3.0	2.29	6.5
15	14.3	2.03	3.6
17	4.0	2.31	7.4
19	4.6	2.27	5.3

TO:

FROM: Mary Lou Nava-Hamaker

SUBJECT: M. S. Study

The following students in your school are part of four groups being studied to complete an M. S. study. We have received permission from _____ to gather this information on these students:

1. Number of years in TLC program before transition to English program
2. Criteria used to transfer student to English (i.e. Lab, teacher judgment, BRT, etc)
3. Other pertinent information such as: retentions, referrals Special Education, teacher's names.

If you are unable to send me the information on the attached forms, could you let me know what day would be convenient for me to gather the information at your school on my own time?

Thank you so much for your help. Neither the students' names nor the school's will be used.

STUDENT	4th gr. CAT Scores	Teacher Names	year/grade reclassified	Criteria used for reclass.	Years in program	COMMENTS
		K				
		1				
		2				
		3				
		4				
		K				
		1				
		2				
		3				
		4				
		K				
		1				
		2				
		3				
		4				
		K				
		1				
		2				
		3				
		4				

TABLE 4 COMPUTATION OF X^2

O	E	O-E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
12	6.40	5.6	31.36	4.900
12	9.33	2.7	7.29	.781
16	23.55	-7.5	56.25	2.388
4	8.89	-4.9	24.01	2.700
9	11.67	-2.7	7.29	.624
37	29.44	7.6	57.76	1.961

$X^2 = 13.354$ $p < .001$

$df = (R-1)(C-1)$
$= (3-1)(2-1)$
$= 2$

AUTHOR ABSTRACT

Mary Lou Nava Hamaker is a Facilatator for Staff Development and Instructional Services for Migrant Education serving Region Ten in the Los Angeles County area. She is presently beginning her Doctoral Program in Educational Policy Planning and Administration at USC. She has been a Bilingual Resource Specialist and Bilingual Teacher in Orange County and has given presentations at National, State and County levels in subjects related to the education of LEP students.

She is married, with five children and enjoys travel, dining, dancing and PreColumbian art.